



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231

SERIAL NUMBER FILING DATE FIRST NAME IN EXAMINER ATTORNEY/AGENT  
07/337, 253 04/13/89 PERRY D

BATEMAN  
P.O. BOX 1359  
DECATUR, IL 62525

SHAY, R

AB1 DMK PAPER NO 19  
3308 19

DATE MAILED 10/16/91

THIS DOCUMENT CONTAINS neither recommendations nor conclusions of the USPTO. It is the property of the USPTO and is loaned to you; it and its contents are not to be distributed outside your organization.

COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS

This application has been examined.  Responsive to communication filed on 9/27/91  This action is made final.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire 3 month(s), 0 days from the date of this letter.  
Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. 35 U.S.C. 133

Part I THE FOLLOWING ATTACHMENT(S) ARE PART OF THIS ACTION:

1.  Notice of References Cited by Examiner, PTO-892.  
3.  Notice of Art Cited by Applicant, PTO-1449.  
5.  Information on How to Effect Drawing Changes, PTO-1474.

2.  Notice re Patent Drawing, PTO-948.  
4.  Notice of Informal Patent Application, Form PTO-152  
6.

Part II SUMMARY OF ACTION

1.  Claims 1-11 and 14 are pending in the application.

Of the above, claims \_\_\_\_\_ are withdrawn from consideration.

2.  Claims 12-13 have been cancelled.

3.  Claims \_\_\_\_\_ are allowed.

4.  Claims 1-11 and 14 are rejected.

5.  Claims \_\_\_\_\_ are objected to.

6.  Claims \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

7.  This application has been filed with informal drawings under 37 C.F.R. 1.85 which are acceptable for examination purposes.

8.  Formal drawings are required in response to this Office action.

9.  The corrected or substitute drawings have been received on \_\_\_\_\_. Under 37 C.F.R. 1.84 these drawings are  acceptable;  not acceptable (see explanation or Notice re Patent Drawing, PTO-948).

10.  The proposed additional or substitute sheet(s) of drawings, filed on \_\_\_\_\_, has (have) been  approved by the examiner;  disapproved by the examiner (see explanation).

11.  The proposed drawing correction, filed \_\_\_\_\_, has been  approved;  disapproved (see explanation).

12.  Acknowledgement is made of the claim for priority under U.S.C. 119. The certified copy has  been received  not been received  been filed in parent application, serial no. \_\_\_\_\_; filed on \_\_\_\_\_.

13.  Since this application appears to be in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

14.  Other

EXAMINER'S ACTION

Art Unit 338

*RC*

The reissue oath or declaration filed with this application is defective because it fails to contain a statement that the applicant believes the original patent to be wholly or partially inoperative or invalid, as required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.175(a)(1).

The reissue oath or declaration filed with this application is defective because it fails to particularly specify the errors relied upon, as required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.175(a)(5).

The declaration makes no mention of the changes claimed in new claim 14.

Claims 1-11 and 14 are rejected as being based upon a defective reissue declaration under 35 U.S.C. § 251. See 37 C.F.R. § 1.175.

As stated on page 9 of the decision by the Board of Appeals mailed August 23, 1991, the court in U.S. Industrial Chemicals, Inc. v. Carbide and Carbon Chemicals, Corp. 315 U.S. 668, 676, 53 USPQ 6, 9-10 (1942):

....it is not enough that an invention might have been claimed in the original patent because it was suggested or indicated in the specification. It must appear from the face of the instrument that what is covered by the reissue was intended to have been covered.

The Board goes on to quote a section of Applicant's amended reissue declaration and states.

"It is thus clear to us from this declaration that there was no intent on the part of the appellants to claim the species having

Art Unit 338

an enclosure made from a plurality of pieces in the original application."

According to the U.S. Industrial Chemicals, Inc. decision cited by the Board, because there was no intent to claim the species having an enclosure made from a plurality of pieces in the original application it is not an error that can be corrected in a reissue application.

**THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a).

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RESPONSE TO THIS FINAL ACTION IS SET TO EXPIRE THREE MONTHS FROM THE DATE OF THIS ACTION. IN THE EVENT A FIRST RESPONSE IS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE MAILING DATE OF THIS FINAL ACTION AND THE ADVISORY ACTION IS NOT MAILED UNTIL AFTER THE END OF THE THREE-MONTH SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD, THEN THE SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD WILL EXPIRE ON THE DATE THE ADVISORY ACTION IS MAILED, AND ANY EXTENSION FEE PURSUANT TO 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a) WILL BE CALCULATED FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THE ADVISORY ACTION. IN NO EVENT WILL THE STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RESPONSE EXPIRE LATER THAN SIX MONTHS FROM THE DATE OF THIS FINAL ACTION.

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Randy Shay at telephone number (703) 308-2907.

R.Shay/pw  
October 11, 1991

*Randy Shay*  
**Randy C. Shay**  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 338